

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS F O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 23313-1450 www.spolic.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/991,900	11/23/2001	Parag Gokhale	606928006US	3389
25096 7590 06/25/2008 PERKINS COIE LLP			EXAMINER	
PATENT-SEA P.O. BOX 1247 SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247			CHEN, TE Y	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1	RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
2	ANALES OF THE DATE AND TO A DEMAND OFFICE
3	UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
4 5	
6	DEEODE THE DOADD OF DATENT ADDEALS
7	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
8	AIND INTERFERENCES
9	
10	Ex parte PARAG GOKHALE, RAJIV KOTTOMTHARAYIL,
11	and SRINIVAS KAVURI
12	and SKINI VAS KA VOKI
13	
14	Appeal 2008-1254
15	Application 09/991,900
16	Technology Center 2100
17	
18	
19	Oral Hearing Held: April 8, 2008
20	
21	
22	
23	Before JOSEPH L. DIXON, LANCE LEONARD BARRY, and CAROLYN
24	D. THOMAS, Administrative Patent Judges.
25	
26	ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANTS:
27	
28	CHRISTOPHER J. WATSON, ESQUIRE
29	PERKINS COIE LLP
30	PATENT-SEA
31	P.O. BOX 1247
32	SEATTLE WA 98111-1247
33	
34	The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday, April 8,
35	2008, commencing at 9:00 a.m., at The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office,
36	600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Dominico Quattrociocchi,
37	Notary Public.

JUDGE DIXON: Carolyn Thomas hearing the case today. 1 2 MR. WATSON: Wonderful. Greetings from cold, dark and wet 3 Seattle. 4 JUDGE BARRY: Well, welcome. 5 JUDGE DIXON: So, you have 20 minutes. You can begin whenever 6 you're ready. 7 MR. WATSON: Sure. So, the issues, all the issues discussed in the Brief I'd like to address states three errors from the Office Action demands. 8 9 First, there's no appropriate rationale provided in the Office Action of the 10 answers to combine the two references, and thus, a prima facie case of 11 obviousness is lacking. 12 Second, primary reference does not disclose exporting from an 13 automated data storage library of removable data storage media like a magnetic paper disk. Neither reference discloses this claimed exported data. 14 JUDGE BARRY: It's hard to believe there's no prima facie. 15 16 JUDGE DIXON: Is there, is there any weight to the argument? 17 MR. WATSON: Finally, neither reference discloses the scheduling 18 of inter-export of a tape from an automated data storage library. So, time 19 permitting let me address each of these three errors. 20 So, typically, back up of data is done at night or on the weekends 21 when there's less than active load on the computer's other servers. And 22 most of these backups involve lots of data gigabits of data, typically, on a 23 magnetic tape or other removable media. And, I'll just talk about tapes for 24 the sake of convenience here, although there's other kinds of removable data 25 storage media that could be used.

So, many of these systems use these automated tape libraries. It's basically a closed box at the computer and a robotic arm that can move a bunch of tapes from shelves or slots in the library to mount or un-mount them; those tapes to drives so that data can be read from the tape or written to the tape.

So, this library is a closed system. It needs to know what tapes are within it so that it can keep track of them. As new tapes are introduced to the library or imported via a special port, the library takes, takes knowledge of each of those newly imported tapes.

Likewise, when tapes are exported from the library, it can remove them from them from the list knowing that they're no longer within its universe of know tapes.

The problem here that the inventors recognize is that this export command that might be issued from a host computer or some server that's ordered this backup saying back up these gigabit to data. Put it on a tape, and export it and maybe send it to Iron Mountain or some outside data storage location. Because, because backups done at night or the weekend, there's no one around then. So, once this command is issued, the tapes automatically export it form the library, but if there's no one there to deal with it, they either get backed up in the output import, or maybe an operator will show up on Monday morning, see a stack of tapes, export it to the library and figure out what to do with them.

And, so it's with that problem in mind that the inventors came upon the claimed invention. Let's address the first error.

Neither of the references alone or in a combination discuss this problem. The primary reference is Crouse (phonetic sp.), and Crouse

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- 1 discusses a file system to better handle, among other things, secondary data, 2. secondary data storage. And, when I mean secondary data storage, what I 3 refer to is, say, archive date. And, that means it's usually put in a format 4 that's different from primary storage. Primary storage is when you can easily access it from a computer. Secondary made some changes often to 5 6 help save space when you're storing this data. And, Crouse deals with the 7 idea of a file system of a way to track files where I'll have online primary 8 easily available data, as well as, secondary data that might be archived 9 stored elsewhere; could be stored in a tape library. Baca deals with the 10 problem of, well how do I export a bunch of tapes out of a group of tapes I 11 might want to export and I don't have to do this surreally. Bacca comes up 12 with the solution of well, I'll put them in magazines or groups of six or so, 13 and I'll export a whole block of them. 14
 - But, neither of these references deal with the problem of when to export a tape. All of them assume that a tape is exported immediately, as soon as the library receives the command. Looking through the Office Action and the answer, I'm, I don't believe that a cogent rationale for the combination of the two references is presented. And, we can go into that further, but let me, let me add move on to talk about the other two errors.

Second, the second error is that Crouse, the primary reference doesn't disclose this claimed data to track when to export references — export tapes, excuse me. There's just no export ID data. Crouse is cited in particular this removable media resource file is cited from Crouse. But, this removable media resource file just identifies a specific entity of removable storage media according there from Crouse. This basically allows the system of Crouse to identify what type of drive to mount the media into; for example,

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

is this a, you know, a particular type of tape that only fits in a particular type of drive, or is it a type of, let's say, an optical disk again is it going to run optical disk drive. Baca only discloses a table to identify where tapes are in the library. But, neither of the references discloses data of when the tapes should later be exported. You know, what time of day, day of week should these tapes later be exported?

Finally, nothing in the prior art that we're discussing here addresses these two times associated with exporting. When you receive in a first time, data that identifies the tape to export, and later at a second time, exporting that tape. In particular, you look at Claim 12, it goes on to recite that there's this user interface that allows a user to receive data identifying the second time in which the tape is scheduled to be exported. So, Baca is cited for the scheduling. But read in context, the particular paragraph of Baca that mentions the word scheduling talks about when to schedule the movement of the robotic arm, which in the library is basically a command queue. The, the scheduling mentioned in the Office Action and the answers when looked at the context at Baca (phonetic sp.), it's directed to the scheduling of the movement of the arm in the, the library. So, you know, there would -- he talks about how you've got to move the arm; these are grippers. You have to open the gripper, grab the tape and move it to some place. And, so there will be a series of command that would tell the robot what to do; move here, open your arms, grab the tape, pull out the tape, move it, put it some place else.

Indeed, the answer effectively admits that Baca only discloses this job scheduling queue on Page 9 in the answer. Also, Baca, around Column 7, Line 50, talks about how but once you export something, you're going to

- 1 have to have a human and operator that take the tape and do something with
- 2 it, or in this case the whole cassette that includes multiple tapes. This would
- 3 have been a convenient place in Baca to describe the scheduling of exporting
- 4 because you once scheduled when the operator was there, but again, there's
- 5 nothing in Baca to describe that.
- 6 JUDGE BARRY: So, the Examiner admits that the primary
- 7 reference doesn't specify this second time?
- 8 MR. WATSON: Correct. And, you would distinguish that just a
- 9 queue is only a feature unspecified time that's not specified at the first time -
- 10 -
- 11 MR. WATSON: Correct.
- 12 JUDGE DIXON: -- when you identify the file.
- 13 MR. WATSON: Correct. And, the first time you specify here's the
- 14 tape I want to export, and here's a second time that I would like it exported,
- and the references when they have a tape to be exported it's effectively
- 16 immediately acted upon. I see effectively because there may be preceding
- 17 commands in the queue that need to be processed first, but it's not
- 18 calendared for, oh let's wait until Monday morning to do this operation.
- 19 JUDGE DIXON: So, as soon as possible is not a, a second time?
- 20 MR. WATSON: Correct.
- 21 JUDGE DIXON: Do you have anything further?
- MR. WATSON: I do not.
- 23 JUDGE DIXON: Any questions? No? Okay, thank you, very much.
- 24 JUDGE THOMAS: Thank you.
- 25 MR. WATSON: Thank you.
- 26 JUDGE DIXON: All right, bye.

Appeal 2008-1254 Application 09/991,900

- 1 MR. WATSON: Bye-bye.
- 2 (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded at 9:40 a.m. on April 8,
- 3 2008).